Register of Conventional Arms

Information Booklet

United Nations

United Nations Centre for Disarmament Affairs

Register of Conventional Arms

Information Booklet

United Nations, New York 1993

Contents

Introduction 1

Part I

Questions and Answers

Basic structure of the Register 3
Defining an international transfer 4
Categories of equipment 7
Re-transfers and co-produced equipment 10
Utilization of report form 12
Administration of the Register 14

Part II

Report on the Register of Conventional Arms

Foreword by the Secretary-General 15
Introduction 16
Technical procedures for the operation of the Register 17
A. General 17
B. Arms transfers 17
C. Categories of equipment the transfers of which are to be registered 18
D. Standardized form for reporting international transfers 19
E. Available background information regarding military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies 21
F. Operation of the Register 21
1. Submission of data on transfers 21
2. Submission of available background information 21
G. Annual consolidated report by the Secretary-General 22
H. Access to the Register 22
Modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register 22
A. General 22
B. Review of the operation of the Register 23
C. Modalities for the addition of further categories of equipment 23
D. Modalities for inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production 24
Resource implications for the maintenance of the Register 25
Letter of Transmittal dated 17 July 1992 from the Chairman of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms to the Secretary-General 27

Part III

Relevant Resolutions of the General Assembly

Resolution 46/36 L
Transparency in armaments 30
Annex 33
Resolution 47/52 L
Transparency in armaments 35
Resolution 48/75 E
Transparency in armaments 36

Part IV

The Register of Conventional Arms: A Challenging Instrument

Introduction 37
Main characteristics of the Register 38
A sound foundation 38
A simple and practical instrument 39
A family of efforts 40
Measures by Governments 40
United Nations standardized system of reporting on military expenditures 41
Work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) 41
Work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) 41
The 1994 Group of Governmental Experts 42
Efforts from outside the UN system 42
Further development and expansion of the Register 43
1994, first evaluation 43
Preparation of future work 43
Issues to be taken up by the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts 44
Other interrelated aspects of transparency in armaments 46
The transparency process and weapons of mass destruction 46
The transparency process and high technology with military applications 46
Conclusion 47

Part V

United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

Exports 49
Imports 50

Introduction

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was established by the Secretary-General on 1 January 1992 in accordance with General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991.

By this resolution, the General Assembly called upon Member States to provide annually, to the Secretary-General, relevant data and information on imports and exports of arms which would be included in the Register. The data should refer to imports into and exports from their territories during the previous calendar year. In accordance with the resolution, arms "exports and imports" represent all forms of arms transfers under terms of grant, credit, barter or cash.

The seven categories of conventional arms on which information will be registered annually are: battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, and missiles and missile launchers.

States are also invited to provide information on their national holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies. The General Assembly further encourages Member States to inform the Secretary-General of their national import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures, both as regards authorization of arms transfers and prevention of illicit transfers.

The Register is intended to be global in nature and voluntary in character. It is aimed at promoting enhanced levels of transparency in armaments, thereby contributing to confidence-building, promoting stability and strengthening regional and international peace and security.

The technical procedures for the Register were developed by a Panel of Governmental Technical Experts established by the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 46/36 L and were endorsed by the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session, in 1992, in its resolution 47/52 L. In 1993, the Register became fully operational, and States submitted information on international transfers of conventional arms for the calendar year 1992.

In order to familiarize Member States with the Register's reporting procedures, the Office for Disarmament Affairs (ODA) organized several workshops in different geographical regions in the period January - March 1993. Workshops were held in Tokyo, Japan, for the Asia-Oceania region; in Buenos Aires, Argentina, for the Latin American region; in Warsaw, Poland, for the Eastern European region; and in Florence, Italy, for the region of the Middle East. In addition to providing a review of the Register's technical procedures, the workshops underlined the importance of transparency in general and of the Register in particular.

To make participation in the workshops more practically oriented, ODA compiled a number of questions and answers originating during the discussions of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts that could be used as helpful tools in furthering understanding of the Register and its technical procedures. As additional questions were raised during the workshops, they were added to the "questions-and-answers" paper. On more then one occasion during the workshops, it was suggested that ODA produce the informal paper as a booklet that could be more widely distributed and, thus, reach a wider audience of Governmental representatives. This booklet responds to that request.

Part I of the booklet consists of 31 questions and answers on the Register and its reporting procedures. Part II reproduces the report of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts conveyed by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session (document A/47/342). Part III contains the texts of General Assembly resolutions 46/36 L,

47/52 L and 48/75 E. Part IV reproduces an overview of the Register given by Ambassador Hendrik Wagenmakers of the Netherlands, Chairman of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts, at the Tokyo workshop, held in January 1993. Part V contains the standardized forms to be used for reporting.

The Centre for Disarmament Affairs extends its appreciation to Ambassador Hendrik Wagenmakers, Dr. Edward Laurance and Dr. Herbert Wulf for their invaluable assistance and support in the development of this booklet. Dr. Laurance and Dr. Wulf served, in their personal capacity, as consultants to the Secretariat on the work of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts and the implementation of the workshops.

Part I

Questions and Answers

The following questions and answers are designed to assist States wishing to participate in the submission of information and data to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms (the Register). The Register was established by the Secretary-General on 1 January 1992 pursuant to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, and was set in motion by resolution 47/52 L of 15 December 1992. The questions and answers relate to the report contained in document A/47/342, dated 14 August 1992, entitled "Report on the Register of Conventional Arms" (the Report). To facilitate referencing, the respective paragraphs of the Report are indicated at the end of each answer. The questions and answers and illustrative examples have been prepared to assist States in completing the standardized forms. They are intended to be illustrative in nature and in no way supersede or replace the agreed language of the Report itself.

Basic structure of the Register

1. What type of activities involving conventional arms are to be reported?

Resolutions 46/36 L and 47/52 L call upon Member States to provide data on an annual basis on the number of items in the seven specified and defined categories of conventional arms imported into or exported from their territory. The resolutions also invite Member States to provide available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies. Furthermore, Member States are encouraged to inform the Secretary-General of their national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures both as regards authorization of arms transfers and prevention of illicit transfers (see the Report, paras. 9 and 20-21; resolution 46/36 L, operative paras. 10 and 18, and resolution 47/52 L, operative para. 5).

2. What type of conventional arms are to be reported in the Register?

Paragraph 14 of the Report lists and describes the characteristics of the seven categories of equipment on which States are requested to supply data to the Register. The categories are the following: battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, and missiles and missile launchers.

3. Are States requested to report all types of arms transfers, including orders and deliveries?

The Register is to include only data on the number of items in the specified categories of equipment imported into and exported from the territory of States in the previous calendar year. To be reported are only those transfers considered by States to have been effected during the relevant reporting year, in conformity with their respective national criteria used to

determine when a transfer becomes effective. States are invited to indicate such national criteria with their return. It is expected that in most cases the data on arms transfers will be originated by actual deliveries (see the Report, paras. 9-13).

Defining an international transfer

An illustrative example

Description of situation

On 13 November 1992 *State A* exported 36 main battle tanks, type AMF-30, to *State Z*, which received title to the tanks upon arrival on 15 December 1992. The specifications of the type AMF-30 tanks shipped are as follows:

Combat weight:	52 tonnes
Maximum road speed:	71 km/hr
Maximum cross-country speed:	50 km/hr
Maximum road range:	550km

The armaments included on these tanks are as follows:

1 x 120 mm gun (imported in 1992 from *State B*)
1 x 12.7 mm machine gun
1 x 7.62 mm anti-aircraft machine gun

Other information: The development of the AMF−30 tank began in 1980, with the first prototype being produced in 1984. Payment (credit) was arranged through the Military Assistance Programme of *State A*. The tanks are part of the procurement programme agreed upon within the Five Nation Regional Security Forum held in 1991.

Reporting transfer at various levels of transparency

The Register allows reporting States to report a transfer at varying levels of transparency, depending on "security and other relevant concerns of Member States" (the Report, para. 19). What follows is the reporting of the above transfer at three levels of transparency.

In Version 1 below, both the exporter and importer States have elected to report the number of items in category I, battle tanks.

Version 1

EXPORTS
Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: __A_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I−VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	Z	36				

IMPORTS

Report of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: __Z_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Exporter State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	A	36				

In Version 2 below, the reporting States have provided additional information on the model/type of tank as well as its capabilities (weight, gun).

Version 2

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: __A_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	Z	36	120mm gun imported from B		Type AMF-30 See Note 1	

Note 1: The weight of the tank is 52 tonnes.

IMPORTS

Report of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: __Z_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Exporter State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	A	36	120mm gun produced in B		Type AMF-30 See Note 1	

Note 1: The weight of the tank is 52 tonnes.

In Version 3 below, *State A* has elected to provide data on the capabilities of the exported tank, the payment arrangements, and information regarding the political/security context in which the transfer occurred. The reporting form for *State Z*, the importer State, is not included as part of this illustrative example. It should be noted that the "Remarks", if any, of *State Z* would reflect the security and other interests of *State Z* and might well differ from those of *State A*, depicted below.

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: ___A_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	Z	36	120mm gun imported from B		Type AMF-30 See Note 1	See Note 2
II. Armoured combat vehicles						

Note 1: Technical specifications: combat weight: 52 tonnes; maximum road speed: 71 km/h; maximum gross-country speed 50 km/h; maximum road range 550 km. Armament: 1 x 120 mm gun (imported in 1992 from *State B*); 1 x 12,7 mm machine gun; 1x 7.62 mm anti-aircraft machine gun. Development of this tank began in 1980; first prototype in 1984.

Note 2: Payment (credit) arrangements have been made in the Military Assistance Programme. The tanks are part of the procurement programme agreed upon within the Five Nation Regional Security Forum held in 1991.

4. Can an export or import occur without the movement of equipment across State borders?

Yes, if a State or its agent is granted title and control over the equipment in the territory of the supplier State. For example, suppose a tank battalion from *State A* is stationed in *State B*. When its mission is complete, the Government of *State A* agrees to sell the tanks to *State B*. When *State B* assumes the title and control of the tanks, both States would report this transaction as a transfer covered by the Register, assuming that the tanks in question meet the descriptions of paragraph 14 of the Report. The same reporting rule would apply if the tanks in question had been stored by *State A* in *State B* as opposed to being in the hands of an active military force as described above (see the Report, para. 11).

5. Must all equipment covered by the Register which moves across international borders be reported?

No. In the above example, if *State A* reinforces its battalion by shipping 20 additional tanks, this is not an export (or import) since the shipment does not involve transfer of title or control of the equipment. Similarly, if these 20 tanks are being shipped to *State B* for the purpose of pre-positioning and remain under the control of *State A*, they are not reported as an export or import (see the Report, paras. 11 and 12)

6. How is the date of export or import determined?

Each State will determine this date based on its national criteria and determine when a transfer becomes effective. States are invited to indicate such national criteria when submitting their export and import data to the Register (see the Report, para. 13).

7. What if items covered by the Register are shipped from *State A* in 1992 but do not arrive at their destination in *State B* until 1993? In which year are they to be reported?

If the exporting *State A* maintains title and control over the equipment until it arrives in *State B*, both *States A* and *B* will report the transfer as occurring in the year 1993. However, if title and control are assumed by *State B* in *State A's* territory prior to shipment, both States will report the transfer as occurring in 1992 (see the Report, para. 13).

Categories of equipment

8. Some of the equipment category definitions involve specific ranges, weights, calibres and combat functions. How are these characteristics to be determined when States are considering specific items to be reported to the Register?

Each State makes the decision as to whether the particular item of equipment that has been exported or imported meets the category criteria found in paragraph 14 of the Report.

9. Will States have to report the transfer of trainer aircraft?

No, unless these trainer aircraft are "designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons, or other weapons of destruction" (the Report, para. 14).

10. If machine guns are mounted on a helicopter which is then exported, is it to be reported as an "attack helicopter"?

Only if the machine gun is linked to and controlled by an "integrated fire control and aiming system" (the Report, para. 14, definition of "attack helicopters").

11. How are States to determine which transfers of missiles and missile launchers are to be reported?

Missiles that are launched from equipment in categories I toVI—battle tank, armoured combat vehicle, large calibre artillery system, combat aircraft, attack helicopter or warship—will be reported. If a missile launcher is not an integral component of an item of equipment in categories I to VI, i.e., stand-alone, ground-mounted or mobile, its export or import *is* to be reported as such. For example, *State A* exports 20 surface-to-surface missile launchers to *State B*. If the missiles used with this launcher meet the criteria contained in paragraph 14, these 20 launchers should be reported as separate items (the Report, paras. 14 and 16).

If a missile launcher is an integral component of an item of equipment in categories I to VI, it is *not* considered a missile launcher and need not to be reported in category VII: missiles and missile launchers.

12. Will States consulting the Register be able to determine the numbers of missiles and missile launchers imported or exported by a specific country?

Not necessarily. Since missile and missile launchers together constitute one category of the Register, it will be difficult to determine their separate numbers unless the reporting States so clarify in the "Remarks" column of the forms (see the Report, paras. 16 and 19).

An illustrative example

State F has exported to *State K* six missile launchers type FLYER and 500 missiles type CATCH-22. The missile launchers are combined into one self-sufficient unit (battery), including radars, command and control computers, a data network and six launchers. The CATCH-22 is a surface-to-surface missile (SSM), has a range of 180 km, and is armed with a conventional warhead. The examples that follow illustrate how *State F* might report on that export, at three different levels of transparency.

In Version 1 below, *State F* has aggregated the missile launchers and missiles, and reports 506 items.

Version 1

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: ___F_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	K	506				

In Version 2 below, *State F* has indicated in column C that the items are broken down into 6 missile launchers and 500 missiles, and, using column B, has confirmed that *State K* is the recipient for both items. In addition, using the "Remarks" column, *State F* has indentified the type of both the launcher and missile.

Version 2

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: ___F_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	1) K 2) K	6 500			1) Launcher, Type FLYER 2) Missile, Type CATCH-22	

In Version 3 below, *State F*, using a note to the "Remarks" section, has described the tactical organization and given some information on range and armament.

Version 3

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: F
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	1) K 2) K	6 500			1) Launcher, Type FLYER 2) Missile, Type CATCH-22 See Note 1	

Note 1: The missile launchers are combined to one self-sufficient unit (battery), including radars, command and control computers, a data network and the six launchers. The 500 surface-to-surface missiles have range of 180 km and are armed with a conventional warhead.

13. What about missile launchers on warships? Many ships covered by the Register have the capability to mount missile launchers. Should the transfer of this type of missile launcher be entered as a separate transfer under category VII?

No. The Report makes it clear that all missile launchers mounted on all warships covered by the Register are considered to be an integral component of the warship itself and thus are *not* to be registered as separate transfers of category VII equipment. However, in reporting on transfers of warships, States may—if they wish to clarify this point—indicate in the "Remarks" column of the form if and how many missile launchers are mounted on the reported warship(s). If, however, a State exports or imports ship-based missile launchers separately from the ship (as is often the case in order to upgrade or modernize ships that are already in the inventory of a navy), these launchers would not be considered an integral part of the ship and would, thus, be reported under category VII of the Register (see the Report, para. 16).

An illustrative example

State B exported to *State J* in 1992 the last two of an order for eight Hermes Class fast attack craft of 400 metric tonnes displacement. The ships are equipped with two twin missile launchers. The stock of four missiles per ship plus five reloads has already been supplied with the previous ship deliveries prior to 1992. The main function of the ships is to prevent illegal fishing in the coastal waters of *State J*. For this purpose the ships are also equipped with a 40 mm gun.

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: __B_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VI. Warships	J	2			Hermes Class, 400 ton fast attack craft See Notes 1 and 2	

Note 1: The ships are equipped with two twin missile launchers.

Note 2: No missiles have been supplied with these two ships. The stock of four missiles per ship plus 5 have already been supplied with the previous ship deliveries. The main function of the ships is to prevent illegal fishing in the coastal waters of *State J*. For this purpose the ships are also equipped with a 40 mm gun.

14. In the definition of category VII, missiles and missile launchers, "ground-to-air missiles" are excluded and are not required to be reported. Does this mean that surface-to-air missiles mounted on ships are not covered by the Register?

"Ground-to-air" refers only to those surface-to-air missiles which are mounted on fixed land sites or on wheeled or tracked mobile launchers. Therefore, surface-to-air missiles mounted on ships are covered by the Register (see the Report, para. 14) (see also question 13).

Re-transfers and co-produced equipment

15. Are States asked to report the export or import of *components* used in the assembly, co-production or upgrading of items associated with the seven categories covered by the Register?

No. The Register only records transfers of *end-items*, as defined in the seven categories. If a component, not an end-item, is imported by a State which then uses this component to produce *and export* an end-item covered by the Register, the end-item would be reported but not the component itself. But, if a set of components which is considered a kit to be assembled is exported or imported, States may choose to declare this as an export or import of the end-item which results from the assembly.

16. How shall items exported by a State other than the State of origin be reported?

They should be reported on the export form, indicating the state of origin in column D of the standardized form (see the Report, para. 18).

An illustrative example

State C exported 70 towed guns, 155 mm calibre, type Homer 155, to *State X*. The guns were in service in *State C* for 10 years and had been originally produced in *State D*. The guns will be

integrated into the coastal defence structure of *State X*. They replace the same number of outdated equipment which was withdrawn in 1992.

EXPORTS
Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: __C_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
III. Large calibre artillery systems	X	70	D See Note 2		Towed Gun Type Homer 155 See Note 1	

Note 1: Technical specifications: 155 mm calibre, wight 12,3 tonnes; firing range 39600 m; rate of fire 2 rounds/min unlimited (normal) 7 rounds/min (maximum); crew 6. The guns will be integrated into the coastal defence structure of *State X*. They replace the same number of outdated equipment which was withdrawn in 1992.

Note 2: The guns were in service in *State C* for 10 years and had been originally produced in *State D*.

17. How should the transfers of equipment to an intermediate location be reported?

If, for example, *State A* transfers air-to-air missiles to *State B* for installation onto combat aircraft to be exported to *State C*, *State A* should report the export of missiles to *State C* and declare in column E of the form that *State B* is the intermediate location (see the Report, para. 18).

An illustrative example

In 1992, *State D* exported to *State C* 72 air-to-air missiles (AAM), type GOAL-104A, and 72 air-to-surface missiles (ASM), type STRIKE-S22, both with a range of 36 km. *State C* installed these missiles on the F-19B multi-role fighter aircraft, and then exported to *State Y* in 1992. The 144 missiles are below the threshold level of Treaty Limited Items and below the maximum range of missiles agreed upon in the Regional Security Treaty of 1989.

Missiles from D to C

EXPORTS
Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: __D_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	1) Y 2) Y	72 72		C for re-export to Y		

Missiles from C to Y as part of combat aircraft export

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: ___C_____
Calendar year: 1992

A	B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	1) Y 2) Y	72 72	D D		1) AAM, type GOAL-104A 2) ASM, type STRIKE-S22 See Note 1	

Note 1: Re-export of missiles with a range of 36 km (imported form *State D*) as part of a multi-role fighter aircraft sale (type F19-B). The same number of missiles has already been exported in 1991. The 144 missiles are below the threshold level of Treaty Limited Items and below the maximum range of missiles agreed upon in the Regional Security Treaty of 1989.

18. Should the transfer of second-hand equipment be reported?

Yes. All transfers relating to equipment included in the seven categories should be reported regardless of the condition of the equipment. The clarification that the transfer consists of second-hand equipment could be made in the "Remarks" section or as a note to the appropriate column. (See also illustrative example for question 16).

19. Which State is to report the transfer of an item which was co-produced by three countries?

The transfer should be reported by the final exporting State. Information concerning the co-production of the item should be given in column D and the "Remarks" section of the standardized form.

Utilization of report form

20. What happens if *State A* does not report the export of 30 aircraft to *State B* because it concludes that these particular aircraft do not meet the criteria specified in the Register for combat aircraft, and *State B*, on the other hand, concludes that it does and thus reports the import?

The Register will show 30 aircraft imported by *State B* from *State A*. However, these particular 30 aircraft will not appear in the Register as being exported by *State A* to *State B*. The Register process contains no provisions for independent verification or reconciliation of the information provided by States.

21. Can a State submit data on items exported and imported which are not covered by the seven categories as defined in paragraph 14 of the Report?

Yes. Since the Register is one important measure to stimulate and promote transparency, States can submit any data which helps to promote this end.

22. What if a State, using the standardized reporting form, submits data on equipment that does not fall under the definition for the categories? For example, suppose a State reports that it exported 30 ground-to-air missiles (specifically excluded from category VII) or missiles with a range less than the reporting criteria of at least 25 kilometres.

Data submitted by a State using the format of the standardized form will be entered in the Register as submitted (see the Report, para. 29).

23. What if a State, after evaluating its exports and imports of conventional arms, determines that it has none which fit the criteria for reporting?

States in this situation are invited to submit a report to the Register clearly stating that no exports or imports have taken place in any of the seven categories during the previous year (see the Report, para. 24). The submission of a blank form without any clarification leaves room for interpretation.

24. Are States requested to submit details on the model, type, designation or technical specifications of the transferred weapons?

States are free to use the "Description of item" column in the "Remarks" section of the standardized form to provide such information. As stated in the Report (para. 19): "This column should be filled in at Member States' discretion." The "Remarks" section is meant to clarify the international arms transfers reported and, therefore, States may wish to enter designation, type or model of equipment, or use various descriptive elements contained in the definitions of categories I to VII. (see the Report, para. 19).

25. What if the data that a State wishes to submit do not fit in the standardized form?

As can be seen in the sample entries above, States are free to use the form in any way they see fit. If the amount of data submitted exceeds the space available in the forms, States may wish to use one form per category, as illustrated in the sample entries.

26. What is meant by the term "available background information", which is referred to in paragraphs 20 and 26 of the Report?

Pursuant to resolutions 46/36 L and 47/52 L, States are invited to submit available background information on military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies. The term "available" indicates that no special reports need to be prepared for submission to the Register. Rather, States are invited to submit those documents generated by their respective Governments during the reporting year which can make their military holdings more transparent (for example, number and type of items of equipment in active and reserve units, in storage, etc.), the number and type of items of equipment produced within the State, and any information which makes a State's policies regarding its production, acquisition and transfers of conventional armaments more transparent.

27. What format should be used for submitting background information?

The background information may be submitted in any form deemed appropriate by a State. The Centre for Disarmament Affairs will maintain an index of the background information submitted, by country, date and title. States should assign titles to their submissions. (See the Report, para. 27).

Administration of the Register

28. When should the data and information be submitted to the United Nations?

States are asked to submit the requested data and information by 30 April annually, beginning in 1993 for the calendar year 1992. The data and information submitted will become an integral part of the Register. The returns should be sent to the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, United Nations Secretariat, Room 3150, New York (see the Report, para. 22).

29. When can the background information be submitted?

Background information may be submitted by States with their annual returns. An index of the documents which have been submitted will be published in the Secretary-General's annual report to the General Assembly on the Register. (See the Report, para. 26).

30. What happens to the arms transfer data and background information once they are submitted?

The Centre for Disarmament Affairs keeps a file of the arms transfer data submissions in printed form as submitted by States and enters the data in a computerized database. Any State may request the data, by disk or printed copy, at any time. The data will be made public in the Secretary-General's annual report to the General Assembly. The background information submitted will be indexed and filed in the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. This information will not be published as a United Nations document but will be available for consultation in the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. (See the Report, paras. 31-33).

31. If a State has a question on the Register and its implementation, how can it contact the Centre for Disarmament Affairs in New York?

The phone number is (212) 963-5540 and the FAX number is (212) 963-1121.

Part II

Report on the Register of Conventional Arms

In its resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts, to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the annex to the resolution necessary for the effective operation of the Register, and to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production. The Assembly further requested the Secretary-General to submit the report to it at its forty-seventh session. The following reproduces the substantive part of the Panel's report with necessary editorial changes.

Foreword by the Secretary-General

On 9 December 1991, the General Assembly adopted resolution 46/36 L entitled "Transparency in armaments", by which it requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts, to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the annex to the resolution necessary for the effective operation of the Register, and to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production.

Accordingly, on 17 July 1992, the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms concluded its deliberations and adopted its report by consensus.

The report consists of three parts. Part I elaborates the technical procedures for the standardized reporting of data on international transfers of seven categories of conventional arms identified in the annex to the resolution. These categories are: battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, missiles and missile launchers. Furthermore, this part of the report describes the manner in which Member States wishing to do so may communicate to the United Nations available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies.

Part II of the report addresses modalities for earliest expansion of the scope of the Register *vis-à-vis* the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production.

Part III deals with the resource implications for the development, upgrading and maintenance of the Register by the United Nations, through the Office for Disarmament Affairs. In particular, this part of the report discusses the resource requirements for the initial operation and storage of the data of the Register as well as the increased complexity of its subsequent continued operation. Special attention is given to the relevant needs of the computerized disarmament database of the Office for Disarmament Affairs which will be used to process information submitted by Governments for inclusion in the Register.

The establishment of the Register of Conventional Arms by the United Nations is a ground-breaking endeavour. As an action-oriented tool that will introduce openness and transparency in the area of international arms transfers, the Register has the potential to foster a climate of confidence and self-restraint, thereby creating an atmosphere more conducive to the effecting of real measures of disarmament. The successful development and operation of the Register could in the final analysis provide the United Nations with indeed an effective instrument in preventive diplomacy.

The Secretary-General wishes to express his special appreciation to the members of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts for their report, which is hereby submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration.

Introduction

1. On 9 December 1991, as part of the larger family of international efforts to promote transparency in military matters, the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 46/36 L entitled "Transparency in armaments". That resolution established the Register of Conventional Arms to include data on international arms transfers as well as available background information provided by Member States on military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies. The Secretary-General's action to that effect was communicated to all Member States in a note verbale of 1 January 1992. In accordance with that resolution Member States are requested to provide data on an annual basis by 30 April each year in respect of imports into and exports from their territory in the previous calendar year, with the first such registration to take place by 30 April 1993 in respect of the calendar year 1992.

2. In paragraph 8 of the same resolution, the Assembly:

> "*Also requests* the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts to be nominated by him on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the annex to the present resolution necessary for the effective operation of the Register, and to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production, and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session."

3. In paragraph 11 (*a*) of the same resolution, the Assembly invites Member States to provide the Secretary-General, not later than 30 April 1994, with their views on the "operation of the Register during its first two years" and "the addition of further categories of equipment and the elaboration of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production". In addition, in paragraph 11 (*b*) of the resolution, the Assembly requests the Secretary-General, "with the assistance of a group of governmental experts convened in 1994 on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, as set forth in paragraphs 12 to 15 below, and the views expressed by Member States for submission to the General Assembly with a view to a decision at its forty-ninth session".

4. In paragraph 12 of the same resolution, the Assembly:

> "*Requests* the Conference on Disarmament to address, as soon as possible, the question of the interrelated aspects of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including military holdings and procurement through national production, and to elaborate universal and non-discriminatory practical means to increase openness and transparency in this field."

In paragraph 13 of the resolution, the Assembly also requested the Conference on Disarmament, *inter alia*, to elaborate practical means to increase openness and transparency "related to the transfer of high technology with military applications and to weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with existing legal instruments".

5. Also, in paragraph 14 of the same resolution, the Assembly

> "*Invites* the Secretary-General to provide to the Conference on Disarmament all relevant information, including, *inter alia*, views submitted to him by Member States and information provided under the United Nations system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures, as well as the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission under its agenda item entitled 'Objective information on military matters'."

In paragraph 15 of the resolution, the Assembly "*Further requests* the Conference on Disarmament to include in its annual report to the General Assembly a report on its work on this issue".

6. In addition to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, Member States, in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the resolution, are urged to take measures at the national, regional and subregional levels aimed at increased openness and transparency in armaments.

7. The present report, a step in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, is the result of the work of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts.

Technical procedures for the operation of the Register

A. General

8. Part I of the work of the Panel stems from the mandate contained in paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, namely "to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the annex to the present resolution necessary for the effective operation of the Register". It is further based on paragraph 7 of the resolution, in which the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to establish and maintain the Register "in accordance with procedures and input requirements initially comprising those set out in the annex to the present resolution and subsequently incorporating any adjustment to the annex decided upon by the General Assembly at the forty-seventh session in the light of the recommendations of the panel referred to in paragraph 8".

B. Arms transfers

9. Paragraph 2 (*a*) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L states that "Member States are requested to provide data for the Register, addressed to the

Secretary-General, on the number of items in the following categories of equipment imported into or exported from their territory". The Panel did not attempt to define arms transfers but, for the purpose of the Register, considered that the terms "imported into or exported from their territory" needed some clarification, as stated in paragraphs 12 and 13 below.

10. International arms transfers involve, in addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the equipment.

11. An international arms transfer may also occur without the movement of equipment across State frontiers if a State, or its agent, is granted title and control over the equipment in the territory of the supplier State. Therefore, a transfer of arms to a State would occur when its forces stationed abroad are granted title and control of equipment by the host country or any third State, or when title and control of such equipment are transferred to the host country or any third State. Additionally, if title and control of equipment temporarily stored or prepositioned on the territory of another State are granted to the host country by the owner, then an international transfer has occurred.

12. Since the supply of equipment by a State to units of its armed forces stationed abroad does not involve transfer of national title and control, such supply is not considered an international transfer. Equipment of a State can be temporarily stored or prepositioned on the territory of another State with no transfer of title and control of this equipment. This is not considered an international arms transfer.

13. In paragraphs 2 (*c*) and (*d*) of the annex to the same resolution, Member States are "requested to provide data on an annual basis by 30 April each year in respect of imports into and exports from their territory in the previous calendar year", with the first such registration taking place by 30 April 1993 in respect of the calendar year 1992. To be reported are those transfers considered by States to have been effected during the relevant reporting year, in conformity with their respective national criteria used to define when a transfer becomes effective. Member States are invited to indicate such national criteria with their return.

C. Categories of equipment the transfers of which are to be registered

14. Paragraph 2 (*a*) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L also identifies the following seven categories of equipment on which Member States are requested to supply data to the Register—battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, and missiles or missile systems. Based on the adjustments to the annex developed by the Panel pursuant to its mandate, the categories and their definitions to be used for reporting to the Register are, as follows:

I. ***Battle tanks***

Tracked or wheeled self-propelled armoured fighting vehicles with high cross-country mobility and a high level of self-protection, weighing at least 16.5 metric tonnes unladen weight, with a high muzzle velocity direct fire main gun of at least 75 millimetres calibre.

II. *Armoured combat vehicles*

Tracked, semi-tracked or wheeled self-propelled vehicles, with armoured protection and cross-country capability, either: (*a*) designed and equipped to transport a squad of four or more infantrymen, or (*b*) armed with an integral or organic weapons of at least 12.5 millimetres calibre or a missile launcher.

III. *Large calibre artillery systems*

Guns, howitzers, artillery pieces, combining the characteristics of a gun or a howitzer, mortars or multiple-launch rocket systems, capable of engaging surface targets by delivering primarily indirect fire, with a calibre of 100 millimetres and above.

IV. *Combat aircraft*

Fixed-wing or variable-geometry wing aircraft designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons, or other weapons of destruction, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized electronic warfare, suppression of air defence or reconnaissance missions. The term "combat aircraft" does not include primary trainer aircraft, unless designed, equipped or modified as described above.

V. *Attack helicopters*

Rotary-wing aircraft designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided or unguided anti-armour, air-to-surface, air-to-subsurface, or air-to-air weapons and equipped with an integrated fire control and aiming system for these weapons, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized reconnaissance or electronic warfare missions.

VI. *Warships*

Vessels or submarines armed and equipped for military use with a standard displacement of 750 metric tonnes or above, and those with a standard displacement of less than 750 metric tonnes, equipped for launching missiles with a range of at least 25 kilometres or torpedoes with similar range.

VII. *Missiles and missile launchers*

Guided or unguided rockets, ballistic or cruise missiles capable of delivering a warhead or weapon of destruction to a range of at least 25 kilometres, and means designed or modified specifically for launching such missiles or rockets, if not covered by categories I through VI. For the purpose of the Register, this category:

(a) Also includes remotely-piloted vehicles with the characteristics for missiles as defined above;

(b) Does not include ground-to-air missiles.

D. Standardized form for reporting international transfers

15. In paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, the Assembly "calls upon all Member States to provide annually for the Register data on imports and exports of arms". Also, in the fourteenth preambular paragraph of the resolution, the Assembly refers to the

utility of "the standardized reporting of international arms transfers" for the promotion of transparency in military matters. Pursuant to its mandate, the Panel developed the standardized reporting form to be used by Member States when providing data for the Register on the number of items exported and imported in each of the seven categories of equipment defined in paragraph 14 above.

16. Pending the review of the operation of the Register in 1994, data on missiles and missile launchers are to be submitted as a single entry in terms of an aggregate number:

(a) For example, if a country imports six missile launchers and 100 associated missiles, as well as 500 missiles associated with other launchers covered under categories I to VI, the number 606 will be entered. If, in a given year, a country exports to a specific country 50 missiles of one type and 80 of another type, the number 130 will be entered in column B.

(b) Missiles that are launched from equipment in categories I to VI will be reported in category VII. Missile launchers integral to equipment in categories I to VI are considered a component of that equipment and are not to be reported in category VII missile launchers. For example, air-to-air missiles for combat aircraft are reported in category VII, but the missile launcher is considered to be the aircraft and its transfer is to be reported in category IV.

17. Column A in the form lists the seven categories as defined above. In column B the exporter State(s) (in the import form) and the importer State(s) (in the export form) are to be entered. In addition, column B includes a serial number, identifying the different exporter and importer State(s) as appropriate. Column C in the form includes the number of items of equipment the transfer of which was effected during the relevant reporting year. Transfers, as described in paragraphs 12 and 13 to be reported, are those that have been effected during the relevant reporting year.

18. Columns D and E on the form are included to accommodate data on countries which are not the countries of export or import. In the case of an international transfer involving an export of equipment by a State other than the State of origin, the name of the country of origin should be entered in column D. In the case of an international arms transfer involving transport of equipment to an intermediate location, or involving retention of equipment at an intermediate location for the purpose of the integration of equipment of one category within the Register with equipment of another category, the name of the intermediate location should be entered in column E (e.g. the export of missiles to an intermediate location for integration there with a combat aircraft manufactured at the intermediate location, or vice versa).

19. The right hand column on the form, divided into two parts, "description of item" and "comments on the transfer", is designed to accommodate additional information on the transfers. Since the provision of such information might be affected by security and other relevant concerns of Member States, this column should be filled in at Member States' discretion; no specific patterns are prescribed. To aid the understanding of the international transfers reported, Member States may wish to enter designation, type or model of equipment, or use various descriptive elements contained in the definitions of categories I to VII, which

also serve as guides to describe equipment transferred. Member States may also use this column to clarify, for example, that a transfer is of obsolete equipment, the result of co-production, or for other such explanatory remarks as Member States see fit.

E. Available background information regarding military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies

20. Pursuant to paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, the Register is to include "information provided by Member States on military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies". Pursuant to paragraph 3 (*a*) of the annex to that resolution, "Member States are invited also to provide to the Secretary-General available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies".

21. The reporting of this information is voluntary and Member States may submit this information in any form they wish.

F. Operation of the Register

1. *Submission of data on transfers*

22. According to paragraph 2 (*c*) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, "each Member State is requested to provide data on an annual basis by 30 April each year in respect of imports into and exports from their territory in the previous calendar year". Paragraph 2 (*d*) of the annex to the resolution states that "the first such registration shall take place by 30 April 1993 in respect of the calendar year 1992".

23. Data should be submitted on the form, taking account of the present report, by 30 April annually to United Nations Headquarters in New York.

24. Member States that do not have anything to report should file a "nil report", clearly stating that no exports or imports have taken place in any of the seven categories during the reporting period.

25. The Office for Disarmament Affairs in the United Nations Secretariat should receive and compile for the Secretary-General's annual report data sheets submitted by Member States and establish a computerized database which will store the reported data.

2. *Submission of available background information*

26. Available background information to be included in the index (as envisaged in paragraph 5 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L) of the annual report of the Secretary-General should be submitted by 30 April of each year.

27. The Office for Disarmament Affairs will maintain in its computerized database a running index of the background information submitted, by country, date and title. Member States should assign titles to their submissions.

G. Annual consolidated report by the Secretary-General

28. According to paragraph 5 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, "the Secretary-General shall provide annually a consolidated report to the General Assembly of the data registered, together with an index of the other interrelated information".

29. Section I of the annual report will be a compilation of the reports submitted by Member States on the standardized reporting form, as they are received by the Secretary-General.

30. Section II of the report will be an index of the background information submitted by Member States.

H. Access to the Register

31. According to paragraph 4 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, "the Register shall be open for consultation by representatives of Member States at any time". The Office for Disarmament Affairs should therefore make available the data and information received to any requesting Member State.

32. Member States should have access to the computerized data contained in the Register of Conventional Arms, either on-line (electronically) or by physical transfer of disks.

33. As well as the Secretary-General's consolidated annual report to the United Nations General Assembly, it is recommended that the available background information submitted by Member States be open to the public.

Modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register

A. General

34. In paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts, "a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session".

35. According to paragraph 11 (*a*) of the same resolution, the Assembly "*invites* Member States to provide the Secretary-General with their views on: (i) the operation of the Register during its first two years; (ii) the addition of further categories of equipment and the elaboration of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production". In paragraph 11 (*b*) of the resolution, the Assembly:

"*Requests* the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts convened in 1994 on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development."

In addition, in paragraph 12 of the resolution, the Assembly:

"*Requests* the Conference on Disarmament to address, as soon as possible, the question of the interrelated aspects of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including military holdings and procurement through national production, and to elaborate universal and non-discriminatory practical means to increase openness and transparency in this field."

In paragraph 13 of the resolution, the Assembly "*also requests* the Conference on Disarmament to address the problems of, and the elaboration of practical means to increase, openness and transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military applications and to weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with existing legal instruments".

36. The issues identified below are offered as a first step in the consideration of modalities for expansion of the Register. The future development of the Register should take into consideration other efforts designed to enhance transparency in armaments and thus contribute to the enhancement of confidence among States.

B. Review of the operation of the Register

37. Since the group of governmental experts to be convened in 1994 is requested in paragraph 11 (*b*) of the resolution to "prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development", it should assess the first two years of the operation of the Register addressing, *inter alia*, the following:

(a) The description of international arms transfers as contained in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the present report;

(b) The standardized reporting form;

(c) The extent of participation by Member States in the Register.

C. Modalities for the addition of further categories of equipment

38. To assist in the future deliberations on the addition of further categories of equipment, the Panel felt that the following might be taken into account:

(a) The possibility of expanding the existing categories by modifying their existing parameters (e.g. tonnage, range, calibre, roles, capabilities and characteristics); or by introducing new parameters or by including subcategories;

(b) The possibility of including new categories:

(i) To take account of significant technical developments relating to the weapons within the existing categories;

(ii) To include weapons not covered by existing categories which should be considered because of their destabilizing potential.

In addition to the points above, future deliberations should draw upon the experience of the operation of the Register.

39. While no decisions are required to be taken regarding the expansion of the scope of the Register until 1994, the Panel considered the possibility of additional categories of equipment that could be reported. It was considered that possible additional categories should be based on substantial agreement so as to ensure the widest possible participation in the Register. A key principle for adding categories should be that of military relevance in terms of the significance of their impact on regional and global stability. The objective should be to enhance transparency, without prejudice to the security of Member States, and help avoid destabilizing accumulations of arms.

40. In the Panel's discussions of the scope of certain categories of equipment, as defined in part I of the present report, issues were raised which, without prejudice to how the forums concerned organize their work, are listed below for their benefit:

(a) Aerial refuelling aircraft;

(b) Reconnaissance aircraft (fixed and rotary wing);

(c) Airborne electronic warfare equipment (fixed and rotary wing);

(d) Airborne early warning and command and control systems (fixed and rotary wing);

(e) Warships: the possibility of lowering or removing the tonnage threshold;

(f) Missiles:

(i) Ground-to-air missiles;
(ii) Range of missiles;
(iii) Unmanned air-breathing vehicles;
(iv) Close-in anti-missile defence system;
(v) Disaggregation of missiles and launchers for the purpose of reporting;

(g) Ammunition, *inter alia*:

(i) Precision-guided;
(ii) Cluster bombs;
(iii) Fuel-air explosives;
(iv) Remotely delivered mines;

(h) Systems for the delivery of weapons of mass destruction not already covered by the Register.

D. Modalities for inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production

41. To assist in the future deliberations on the subject of including data on military holdings and procurement through national production in the Register, the Panel felt that a common understanding is required of what constitutes military holdings and procurement through national production. The terms military holdings and procurement through national production need to be defined for the purpose of the Register. With these considerations in mind the following questions were raised by the Panel:

(a) What constitutes armed forces for the purpose of reporting military holdings? In addition to holdings of regular forces, are those of paramilitary, coastguard, reserve and other types of forces, such as organizations designed and structured to perform peacetime internal security functions, to be included?

(b) Should a legal approach be adopted, defining armed forces as those which take on combatant status in time of war?

(c) Should military holdings be reported on the basis of the same categories of equipment as for arms transfers?

(d) Should equipment in storage or mothballed, awaiting decommissioning or in transit be considered as military holdings and be included?

(e) Should equipment in the process of manufacture or manufacturing-related testing, used exclusively for research and development or belonging to historical collections be included?

(f) Regarding data on procurement through national production:

(i) Should data be reported in values and/or in the number of items procured?

(ii) Should procurement be regarded as procurement from any national production facility, whatever the arrangement may be, for example, international collaborative production, licence, and so forth?

(iii) Should equipment procured externally in separate parts and later assembled be considered procurement through national production or reported as imported equipment?

(iv) Should data on procurement through national production relate to equipment ordered by or only that actually delivered to the armed forces (however defined)?

(v) Should data on the upgrading of equipment be included?

Resource implications for the maintenance of the Register

42. At the Panel's request, the following estimates of resources required for the operation of the Register were provided by the United Nations Secretariat.

43. As currently envisaged, the initial operation and storage of the data of the Register can be accommodated through the projected hardware and software system within the Office for Disarmament Affairs. Incremental start-up costs would be limited to computer hardware and software required for system development, and testing at an estimated cost of $50,000.

44. However, the subsequent operation of the system, that is, installation of the data concerning arms transfers, as well as "background information regarding military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies", as Member States were invited to do so by the resolution, will considerably increase the operational complexity of the system and the workload of the Secretariat.

45. Moreover, for the database of the Register to be electronically accessible by Member States, an initial estimated amount of $75,000 would be required to develop the system, support it and distribute related instructional and training material.

46. The development, upgrading and maintenance of the Register would require staff from the Office for Disarmament Affairs with politico-military expertise, especially in the area of arms transfers, in combination with a highly specialized knowledge in the field of database management and systems analysis. Such expertise is currently not available within the Office for Disarmament Affairs. In addition, the day-to-day operation of the Register requires one General Service staff experienced in the basics of programming.

47. Based on available information as well as the experience gained in the maintenance of the United Nations system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures, it is estimated that the Office for Disarmament Affairs would require three additional posts at a total cost of $228,000 per year. The breakdown is divided as follows: one post at the P-5 level - $115,700; one post at the P-2 level - $67,500; and one post at the G-5 level - $45,400 per annum.

48. These estimates are approximations, since it would be impossible to forecast accurately the volume of the work involved in the operation of the Register.

49. The Panel of Governmental Technical Experts recommends that the issue be reviewed by the appropriate United Nations bodies to ensure the most cost-effective use of resources.

Letter of Transmittal dated 17 July 1992 from the Chairman of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to submit herewith the report of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms, which was appointed by you in pursuance of paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991.

The governmental technical experts were the following:

Mr. Alexander Akalovsky
Bureau of Multilateral Affairs
United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Washington, D.C., United States of America

Dr. Ján Chandoga
Deputy Director, Department of
International Organizations
Head of the Disarmament Division
Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Prague, Czech and Slovak Federal Republic

Mr. Francesco Cottafavi
First Counsellor
Permanent Mission of Italy
to the United Nations
New York

Mr. Jean-Paul Credeville
Administrateur Civil
Ministère de la Défense
Délégation aux Relations Internationales
Armée, France

Brigadier General Kobla Medzedzemeo Dogbatse
General Headquarters
Operations and Plans
Accra, Ghana

Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki
Ambassador for Disarmament and Arms Control
United Nations Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Tokyo, Japan

Major General (ret.) Ahmed Ismail Fakhr
Director,
National Center for Middle East Studies
Cairo, Egypt

Mr. Antonino Lisboa Mena Gonçalves
Head of the Foreign Information Secretariat
Brazilian Ministry of External Relations
Brasilia, Brazil

Mrs. Zadalinda Gonzalez
Minister
Directorate I for United Nations Systems
Ministry of External Affairs
Mexico City, Mexico

Mr. Rafael M. Grossi
First Secretary
Alternate Representative of the Argentine Republic
to the Conference on Disarmament
Geneva, Switzerland

Colonel Abdul Wahid Haji Anwar
Strategic Planning Division
Ministry of Defense
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Mr. P. G. Litavrin
Counsellor
Department for Disarmament
and Arms Technology Control
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Russian Federation
Moscow, Russia

Mr. SHA Zukang
Counsellor
Department of International Organizations
and Conferences
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Beijing, People's Republic of China

Mr. Donald C. Sinclair
Deputy Director
Arms Control and Disarmament Division
Department of External Affairs
Ottawa, Canada

Mr. Rakesh Sood
Director (Disarmament)
Ministry of External Affairs
New Delhi, India

Colonel T. T. Taylor
Deputy Head
Defence Arms Control Unit
Ministry of Defence
London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland

Ambassador Hendrik Wagenmakers
Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
to the United Nations Office at Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland

The report was prepared between January and July 1992, during which period the Panel held three sessions in New York, the first from 27 to 31 January, the second from 31 March to 10 April and the third from 6 to 17 July 1992.

In carrying out its work, the Panel had before it relevant publications and papers which were circulated by members of the Panel.

The members of the Panel wish to express their appreciation for the assistance which they received from members of the Secretariat. They wish, in particular, to thank Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Prvoslav Davinic, Director, Office for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Timur Alasaniya, who served as Secretary of the Panel, and Dr. Edward Laurance and Dr. Herbert Wulf, who served in their private capacity as consultants to the Secretary.

I have been requested by the Panel of governmental technical experts, as its Chairman, to submit to you, on its behalf, this report, which was unanimously approved.

(Signed) Hendrik WAGENMAKERS
Chairman of the
Panel of Governmental Technical Experts
on the Register of Conventional Arms

Part III

Relevant Resolutions of the General Assembly

Resolution 46/36 L
Transparency in armaments

The General Assembly,

Realizing that excessive and destabilizing arms build-ups pose a threat to national, regional and international peace and security, particularly by aggravating tensions and conflict situations, giving rise to serious and urgent concerns,

Noting with satisfaction that the current international environment and recent agreements and measures in the field of arms limitation and disarmament make it a propitious time to work towards easing tensions and a just resolution of conflict situations, as well as more openness and transparency in military matters,

Recalling the consensus among Member States on implementing confidence-building measures, including transparency and exchange of relevant information on armaments, likely to reduce the occurrence of dangerous misperceptions about the intentions of States and to promote trust among States,

Considering that increased openness and transparency in the field of armaments could enhance confidence, ease tensions, strengthen regional and international peace and security and contribute to restraint in military production and the transfer of arms,

Realizing the urgent need to resolve underlying conflicts, to diminish tensions and to accelerate efforts towards general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control with a view to maintaining regional and international peace and security in a world free from the scourge of war and the burden of armaments,

Recalling also that in paragraph 85 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly it urged major arms supplier and recipient countries to consult on the limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional arms,

Disturbed by the destabilizing and destructive effects of the illicit arms trade, particularly for the internal situation of affected States and the violation of human rights,

Bearing in mind that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, Member States have undertaken to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, and that the reduction of world military expenditures could have a significant positive impact for the social and economic development of all peoples,

Reaffirming the important role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the commitment of Member States to take concrete steps in order to strengthen that role,

Recalling its resolution 43/75 I of 7 December 1988,

Welcoming the study submitted by the Secretary-General, pursuant to paragraph 5 of resolution 43/75 I and prepared with the assistance of governmental experts, on ways and

means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms, as well as the problem of the illicit arms trade, taking into account views of Member States and other relevant information,

Recognizing the major contribution of an enhanced level of transparency in armaments to confidence-building and security among States, and also recognizing the urgent need to establish, under the auspices of the United Nations, as a first step in this direction, a universal and non-discriminatory register to include data on international arms transfers as well as other interrelated information provided to the Secretary-General,

Stressing the importance of greater transparency in the interest of promoting readiness to exercise restraint in accumulation of armaments,

Considering that the standardized reporting of international arms transfers together with the provision of other interrelated information to a United Nations register will constitute further important steps forward in the promotion of transparency in military matters and, as such, will enhance the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in promoting arms limitation and disarmament, as well as in maintaining international peace and security;

Recognizing also the importance of the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction,

1. *Recognizes* that an increased level of openness and transparency in the field of armaments would enhance confidence, promote stability, help States to exercise restraint, ease tensions and strengthen regional and international peace and security;

2. *Declares its determination* to prevent the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including conventional arms, in order to promote stability and strengthen regional or international peace and security, taking into account the legitimate security needs of States and the principle of undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments;

3. *Reaffirms* the inherent right to individual or collective self-defence recognized in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which implies that States also have the right to acquire arms with which to defend themselves;

4. *Reiterates its conviction*, as expressed in its resolution 43/75 I, that arms transfers in all their aspects deserve serious consideration by the international community, *inter alia*, because of:

(a) Their potential effects in further destabilizing areas where tension and regional conflict threaten international peace and security and national security;

(b) Their potentially negative effects on the progress of the peaceful social and economic development of all peoples;

(c) The danger of increasing illicit and covert arms trafficking;

5. *Calls upon* all Member States to exercise due restraint in exports and imports of conventional arms, particularly in situations of tension or conflict, and to ensure that they have in place an adequate body of laws and administrative procedures regarding the transfer of arms and to adopt strict measures for their enforcement;

6. *Expresses its appreciation* to the Secretary-General for his study on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms, which also addressed the problem of the illicit arms trade;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to establish and maintain at United Nations Headquarters in New York a universal and non-discriminatory Register of Conventional

Arms, to include data on international arms transfers as well as information provided by Member States on military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies, as set out in paragraph 10 below and in accordance with procedures and input requirements initially comprising those set out in the annex to the present resolution and subsequently incorporating any adjustments to the annex decided upon by the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session in the light of the recommendations of the panel referred to in paragraph 8 below;

8. *Also requests* the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts to be nominated by him on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the annex to the present resolution necessary for the effective operation of the Register, and to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production, and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session;

9. *Calls upon* all Member States to provide annually for the Register data on imports and exports of arms in accordance with the procedures established by paragraphs 7 and 8 above;

10. *Invites* Member States, pending the expansion of the Register, also to provide to the Secretary-General, with their annual report on imports and exports of arms, available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies, and requests the Secretary-General to record this material and to make it available for consultation by Member States at their request;

11. *Decides*, with a view to future expansion, to keep the scope of and the participation in the Register under review, and, to this end:

(a) Invites Member States to provide the Secretary-General with their views, not later than 30 April 1994, on:

(i) The operation of the Register during its first two years;

(ii) The addition of further categories of equipment and the elaboration of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production;

(b) Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts convened in 1994 on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament as set forth in paragraphs 12 to 15 below and the views expressed by Member States, for submission to the General Assembly with a view to a decision at its forty-ninth session;

12. *Requests* the Conference on Disarmament to address, as soon as possible, the question of the interrelated aspects of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including military holdings and procurement through national production, and to elaborate universal and non-discriminatory practical means to increase openness and transparency in this field;

13. *Also requests* the Conference on Disarmament to address the problems of, and the elaboration of practical means to increase, openness and transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military applications and to weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with existing legal instruments;

14. *Invites* the Secretary-General to provide to the Conference on Disarmament all relevant information, including, *inter alia*, views submitted to him by Member States and information provided under the United Nations system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures, as well as on the work of the Disarmament Commission under its agenda item entitled "Objective information on military matters";

15. *Further requests* the Conference on Disarmament to include in its annual report to the General Assembly a report on its work on this issue;

16. *Invites* all Member States, in the meantime, to take measures on a national, regional and global basis, including within the appropriate forums, to promote openness and transparency in armaments;

17. *Calls upon* all Member States to cooperate at a regional and subregional level, taking fully into account the specific conditions prevailing in the region or subregion, with a view to enhancing and coordinating international efforts aimed at increased openness and transparency in armaments;

18. *Also invites* all Member States to inform the Secretary-General of their national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures, both as regards authorization of arms transfers and prevention of illicit transfers;

19. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session on progress made in implementing the present resolution, including relevant information provided by Member States;

20. *Notes* that effective implementation of the present resolution will require an up-to-date database system in the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat;

21. *Decides* to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-seventh session an item entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Annex

Register of Conventional Arms

1. The Register of Conventional Arms ("the Register") shall be established, with effect from 1 January 1992, and maintained at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

2. Concerning international arms transfers:

(a) Member States are requested to provide data for the Register, addressed to the Secretary-General, on the number of items in the following categories of equipment imported into or exported from their territory:

I. ***Battle tanks***

A tracked or wheeled self-propelled armoured fighting vehicle with high cross-country mobility and a high level of self-protection, weighing at least 16.5 metric tonnes unladen weight, with a high muzzle velocity direct fire main gun of at least 75 millimetres calibre.

II. ***Armoured combat vehicles***

A tracked or wheeled self-propelled vehicle, with armoured protection and cross-country capability, either: (*a*) designed and equipped to transport a squad of four or more infantrymen, or (*b*) armed with an integral or organic weapon of at least 20 millimetres calibre or an anti-tank missile launcher.

III. ***Large calibre artillery systems***

A gun, howitzer, artillery piece combining the characteristics of a gun and a howitzer, mortar or multiple-launch rocket system, capable of engaging surface targets by delivering primarily indirect fire, with a calibre of 100 millimetres and above.

IV. ***Combat aircraft***

A fixed-wing or variable-geometry wing aircraft armed and equipped to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons, or other weapons of destruction.

V. ***Attack helicopters***

A rotary-wing aircraft equipped to employ anti-armour, air-to-ground, or air-to-air guided weapons and equipped with an integrated fire control and aiming system for these weapons.

VI. ***Warships***

A vessel or submarine with a standard displacement of 850 metric tonnes or above, armed or equipped for military use.

VII. ***Missiles or missile systems***

A guided rocket, ballistic or cruise missile capable of delivering a payload to a range of at least 25 kilometres, or a vehicle, apparatus or device designed or modified for launching such munitions.

(b) Data on imports provided under the present paragraph shall also specify the supplying State; data on exports shall also specify the recipient State and the State of origin if not the exporting State;

(c) Each Member State is requested to provide data on an annual basis by 30 April each year in respect of imports into and exports from their territory in the previous calendar year;

(d) The first such registration shall take place by 30 April 1993 in respect of the calendar year 1992;

(e) The data so provided shall be recorded in respect of each Member State;

(f) Arms "exports and imports" represent in the present resolution, including its annex, all forms of arms transfers under terms of grant, credit, barter or cash.

3. Concerning other interrelated information:

(a) Member States are invited also to provide to the Secretary-General available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies;

(b) The information so provided shall be recorded in respect of each Member State.

4. The Register shall be open for consultation by representatives of Member States at any time.

5. In addition, the Secretary-General shall provide annually a consolidated report to the General Assembly of the data registered, together with an index of the other interrelated information.

Resolution 47/52 L
Transparency in armaments

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, entitled "Transparency in armaments",

Continuing to take the view that an enhanced level of transparency in armaments contributes greatly to confidence-building and security among States and that the establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, contained in the annex to resolution 46/36 L, constitutes an important step forward in the promotion of transparency in military matters,

Welcoming the Secretary-General's report on the technical procedures and adjustments to the annex necessary for the effective operation of the Register and on the modalities for its early expansion,

Welcoming also the guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters as adopted by consensus in the Disarmament Commission,

Welcoming further the report of the Conference on Disarmament on its agenda item entitled "Transparency in armaments",

1. *Declares* its determination to ensure the effective operation of the Register of Conventional Arms as provided for in paragraphs 7, 9 and 10 of its resolution 46/36 L;

2. *Endorses* the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report on the technical procedures and adjustments to the annex necessary for the effective operation of the Register;

3. *Notes* the suggestions offered in the report as a first step in the consideration of modalities for early expansion of the Register;

4. *Calls upon* all Member States to provide the requested data and information to the Secretary-General by 30 April annually, beginning in 1993;

5. *Encourages* Member States to inform the Secretary-General of their national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures, both as regards authorization of arms transfers and prevention of illicit transfers, in conformity with paragraph 18 of its resolution 46/36 L;

6. *Reaffirms* its request to the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development with the assistance of a group of governmental experts convened in 1994 on the basis of equitable geographical representation;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the United Nations Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register;

8. *Encourages* the Conference on Disarmament to continue its work undertaken in response to the requests contained in paragraphs 12 to 15 of resolution 46/36 L;

9. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report on progress made in implementing the present resolution to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session;

10. *Decides* to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-eighth session the item entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Resolution 48/75 E
Transparency in armaments

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 46/36 L of 9 December 1991 and 47/52 L of 15 December 1992 entitled "Transparency in armaments",

Continuing to take the view that an enhanced level of transparency in armaments contributes greatly to confidence-building and security among States and that the establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms constitutes an important step forward in the promotion of transparency in military matters,

Welcoming the consolidated report of the Secretary-General on the first year of operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms,

Encouraged by the response of Member States pursuant to paragraphs 9 and 10 of its resolution 46/36 L to provide data on their imports and exports of arms as well as available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies,

Welcoming the work of the Conference on Disarmament under its agenda item entitled "Transparency in armaments",

Welcoming further the organization by Member States of initiatives and seminars aimed at promoting transparency in military matters through a widespread reporting of data to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms,

1. *Reaffirms* its determination to ensure the effective operation of the Register of Conventional Arms as provided for in paragraphs 7, 9 and 10 of its resolution 46/36 L;

2. *Calls upon* all Member States to provide the requested data and information for the Register to the Secretary-General by 30 April annually;

3. *Reaffirms* its request to the Secretary-General to prepare a report, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 1994 on the basis of equitable geographical representation, on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament and the views expressed by Member States, with a view to a decision at its forty-ninth session;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the United Nations Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register;

5. *Encourages* the Conference on Disarmament to continue its work undertaken in response to the requests contained in paragraphs 12 to 15 of resolution 46/36 L;

6. *Reiterates* its call upon all Member States to cooperate at a regional and subregional level, taking fully into account the specific conditions prevailing in the region or subregion, with a view to enhancing and coordinating international efforts aimed at increased openness and transparency in armaments;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session on progress made in implementing the present resolution;

8. *Decides* to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-ninth session the agenda item entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Part IV

The Register of Conventional Arms: A Challenging Instrument

Hendrik Wagenmakers

Introduction

The establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms on 1 January 1992 was a major step forward as the international community comes to grips with the security problems of the post-cold war era. Indeed, developing transparency is an essential requirement in the effort to prevent destabilizing accumulations of arms in different regions of the world. Who would not agree that the events which led to the Gulf war are a typical example of an excessive and destabilizing arms build-up? The Register is as an action-oriented tool whose value rests in its potential to foster a climate of confidence and restraint, and to rectify the misconceptions which fuel fear and mistrust.

Obviously, the utility of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms will depend on the number of States that actually contribute to it. Adequate development of the Register and related efforts will have the best chances of success on the basis of the widest possible participation. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations observed, the successful development and operation of the Register could in the final analysis provide the United Nations with an effective instrument in preventive diplomacy.

In order to help Member States of the United Nations in making their reports to the Register, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to set up in 1992 a Panel of Governmental Technical Experts on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the Annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L necessary for the effective operation of the Register. In addition, the Panel was asked to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production.

Hendrik Wagenmakers, Ambassador of the Netherlands to the Conference on Disarmament, served as Chairman of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts. This paper was presented at a workshop on the Register held in Tokyo, Japan, in January 1993; the views expressed therein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the policy of the Netherlands Government.

I had the honour to chair this Panel in New York during 1992. The members came from all geopolitical quarters. Experts from the following 17 Member States of the United Nations participated: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Egypt, France, Ghana, India, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Russian Federation, United Kingdom and United States. The Panel members held varying views on quite a number of issues. This is no surprise, since the relation between transparency and the traditional perception of military security is by definition not an easy one. All the greater was my satisfaction that the Panel came to a *consensus* report (A/47/342) and that the General Assembly of the United Nations endorsed the Panel's recommendations last December, again by *consensus* (resolution 47/52 L).

The created momentum was reinforced by the unreserved support given to the Register by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his report of 23 October 1992, entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post–cold war era" (A/C.1/47/7).

Thus the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms has acquired a strong foundation for its future use and further development. The material to build that future will have to come from the Member States of the United Nations. This can only mean that wide participation in the Register is essential to the future success of the enterprise the international community has embarked upon under the rubric "Transparency in armaments".

I shall make some comments on the main characteristics of the Register and its environment, constituted by a family of efforts. Furthermore I shall discuss some issues concerning the further development and expansion of the Register. In particular I shall look into the issues to be taken up by the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts. Thereafter I shall touch upon other interrelated aspects of transparency in armaments, such as weapons of mass destruction and high technology with military applications, issues the Geneva Conference on Disarmament is presently dealing with. Finally, comes my conclusion from all this.

Main characteristics of the Register

A sound foundation

As part of the wider transparency process, the Register is founded on well-enshrined basic principles of truly cooperative security among States. I refer to such principles as:

- maintenance of international peace and security, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations;
- the inherent right of self-defence;
- preservation of regional peace, security and stability (reasonable defence sufficiency);
- undiminished security for all States at the lowest possible level of armaments;
- recognition of the legitimacy of conventional arms transfers to meet the security and defence needs of Member States of the United Nations;
- partnership and equal responsibility of both supplier and recipient States, or, in other words, the need to exercise due restraint in exports and imports.

With the establishment of the Register a generation-old aspiration of mankind, dating from the time of the League of Nations, has come true. Both the adoption of the Panel Report by consensus as well as the endorsement of the Panel's recommendations by the General

Assembly of the United Nations in 1992 without a vote demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of the States in the world desire a Register of Conventional Arms and agree with its basic objectives. This strong political support is a force to be reckoned with, since this support came from all geopolitical quarters.

The submission in 1991 by the Twelve Member States of the European Community and Japan of a concrete proposal to the General Assembly was not developed in isolation. In 1978, the tenth special session of the General Assembly had urged major arms supplier and recipient countries to consult on the limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional arms. For their part, the Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at their Belgrade Summit of 1989 had stressed that "the issue of international arms transfers should be addressed in conjunction with the question of reducing international tensions, enhancing confidence, promoting the peaceful settlement of conflicts, checking the arms race and realizing disarmament under effective international control". A similar call was made by the Non-Aligned Summit held in Jakarta in 1992, which stressed the urgency of the need to curb the development and excessive build-up of conventional armaments and all other kinds of armaments. It would go too far to enumerate the various specific initiatives taken, but they come from all regions of the world.

In this context, it should be remembered that the data and information provided to the Register are supplied on a voluntary basis. The Register has no monitoring capability, but States are free to take up their concerns, resulting from the data and information provided, bilaterally. Development of worldwide agreements enabling monitoring and verification can only be envisaged as the final step of a gradual process.

A simple and practical instrument

The basic elements of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms are the following: Member States of the United Nations are requested to submit data by 30 April each year on the number of items annually exported or imported in the previous year, by country, for seven major types of armaments: battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships with a displacement of 750 metric tonnes or above (and any size ship with missiles or torpedoes with a range of 25 kilometres or more), and missiles and missile launchers with a range of at least 25 kilometres (the missile category does not include ground-to-air missiles). All categories include a description of what is covered, including types of accompanying armaments, ranges, and tonnage. The first five categories closely parallel the descriptions developed for the identical categories in the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE).

The weapons transfers to be reported under the Register of Conventional Arms concern major operational systems, categories of weapons with a proven suitability for use in surprise attacks and large-scale offensive military actions, not small fry. These systems are relatively easy to identify, define, record and monitor. The Register is innovative in that it brings in arms categories which hitherto have not been the object of international reporting. I refer to warships and missiles and missile launchers.

The reporting procedures of the Register were designed to achieve the goals of non-discrimination and universality. The one page standardized reporting form is easy to fill in; in that sense it gives testimony to the Register's practicality. The relative simplicity of the standardized reporting form is susceptible of convincing States to submit data in the most transparent mode possible. The seriousness of the standardized reporting form is brought out by the fact that it contains a last, separate column, entitled: "Remarks". This column is

designed to accommodate additional information, such as description of the item (i.e. designation, type or model of equipment reported), or comments on the transfer. However, the "Remarks" column has been given an important caveat which allows that "such information might be affected by security and other relevant concerns" and "should be filled in at Member State's discretion".

Contrary to other reporting exercises, the Register is self-checking: the return of one State has to match that of the other State involved in a reported transfer. This is in conformity with the basic concept of transparency which requires consistency of information. The computerized database of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (ODA) holds out the prospect of maximizing access by Member States, either on line (electronically) or by physical transfer of disks.

It is with a view to fulfilling the same objective of consistency of information that the General Assembly has recommended that Member States should also—preferably together with their reports on international arms transfers—as of now provide to the Secretary-General available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies. The term "available" indicates that no special reports need to be prepared for submission to the Register.

All in all, thanks to the standardized reporting form as developed by the 1992 Panel, the Register constitutes an effective tool to deal with excessive and destabilizing accumulations of conventional arms. By submitting data and information to the Register, States are in effect saying that they do not view their exports and imports as excessive or destabilizing.

A family of efforts

The Register reflects a building-block approach. It is an initial step towards a more comprehensive system of cooperative security. In fact, General Assembly resolution 46/36 L provides a roadmap according to which formal and informal approaches, in a mutually reinforcing way, will help to bring about a new political and security relationship between Member States of the United Nations, a relationship characterized by transparency, trust and partnership. It is important to note here that the concept of enhancing transparency, as developed by the General Assembly and supported by the important declaration of the first-ever Summit of the United Nations Security Council on 31 January 1992, transcends the mere registration of arms transfers.

One has to begin somewhere, however, and so the first building block in the formal approach is constituted by participation in the Register of Conventional Arms. Member States, like the ones represented around this table, are expected to make these reports, pertaining to transfers that occurred in the calendar year 1992, available to the Secretary-General by 30 April 1993. And even if it is debatable whether these returns will provide a significant net increase in knowledge about flows of weapons and who has how much of what, there is still the key point that for the first time Governments will submit official, accountable data to other Governments. In other words, no military secrets are compromised. In effect, most of the data and information to be reported has already been made public by professional entities, such as the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. However, steps of qualitatively high political relevance are being taken in terms of accountability.

Measures by Governments

The resolution that established the Register of Conventional Arms also invited all Member States to take parallel measures on a national, regional and global basis to promote

openness and transparency in armaments (resolution 46/36 L, operative paras. 16 and 17). It also called upon all Member States to cooperate to this end at a regional and subregional level, of course taking into account the specific conditions prevailing in the region or subregion.

Another measure that Governments are invited to take in the context of promoting transparency in armaments is to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of their national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures. Quite a few Member States have done so, and the information on their national arms import and export policies has been published by the Secretary-General (document A/47/370 and addenda).

Cooperative measures by Governments aimed at the prevention of the illicit arms trade are also relevant. Nobody can deny that the consequences of the illicit arms trade can often be disproportionately large. Illegally transferred arms, even small arms, may under certain circumstances undermine the internal security and socio-economic development of affected States. The ensuing threat to national or regional stability is evidently at variance with our common purpose.

United Nations standardized system of reporting on military expenditures

One should not forget that one particular instrument to promote transparency and openness in military matters has been in place for quite a few years already: the United Nations Standardized System of Reporting on Military Expenditures. Participation in the reporting system has been disappointing. But it nevertheless has the potential of being one of the building-blocks in promoting greater transparency. This exercise is complementary to that of the Register of Conventional Arms.

Work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC)

Last year, the UNDC adopted by consensus a set of guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters. These guidelines are to be found in the report of the UNDC to the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly (A/47/42). This report states, *inter alia,* that openness and transparency help to build confidence, relax tensions and promote agreements on other measures of disarmament. With respect to the Register of Conventional Arms, the UNDC recommended that the Register be operated and developed on the basis of resolution 46/36 L, by which the Register was established. Furthermore, the UNDC is going to continue its deliberations on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields (see page 46).

Work of the Conference on Disarmament (CD)

Upon the request of the General Assembly, the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament addressed, during its 1992 session, the issue of transparency in armaments. Among the topics discussed were the so-called interrelated aspects of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including military holdings and procurement through national production. These two categories, i.e. military holdings and weapons procured from national defence industries, are currently not covered by the standardized reporting form of the Register (see pages 45 to 46).

Included in the work of the CD is the elaboration of practical means to increase openness and transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military applications and to weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with existing legal instruments (see page 46). The CD held a preliminary exchange of views on these issues. Quite a few ideas were put forward,

as reflected in the report of the CD to the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly (A/47/27).

The 1994 Group of Governmental Experts

In resolution 46/36 L, the Secretary-General was requested to set up a group of governmental experts the following year to review the continuing operation of the Register as well as to examine its further development. That experts group will have at its disposal, *inter alia*, the Secretary-General's consolidated reports on the Register, covering the calendar years 1992 and 1993, respectively. The data and background information contained in those reports will illustrate what progress has been made in implementing the Register. Further guidance for the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts consists of relevant information on national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures provided by Member States to the Secretary-General. As of January 1993, the relevant information I just referred to has already been submitted by Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sweden, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (A/47/370, and addenda).

Efforts from outside the UN system

From outside the United Nations system the transparency process is stimulated by agreements on a regional scale, such as the confidence- and security-building measures adopted by the States participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the exchanges of information under the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the Open Skies Treaty. Similar moves are noticeable in other regions. For Asia, I refer to the important Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia. Last year's General Assembly recognized that this Treaty "provides a strong foundation for regional confidence-building and for regional cooperation". Support from another region is expressed in a recent declaration of the Organization of American States.

A further example of cooperative measures by Governments is to be found in the present-day operationalization of the Declaration on Non-Proliferation and Arms Exports adopted by the European Council in Luxembourg in June 1991. I cite also the support and firm commitment to the Register expressed by the CSCE Council in their Prague declaration of January 1992.

Finally there are the guidelines worked out by the Permanent Five (the five permanent members of the Security Council) in their cooperative efforts aimed at arms control in the Middle East. These guidelines could eventually be adopted universally, bearing in mind that they represent a floor, not a ceiling, and that individual States could adopt more stringent criteria. With a view to obviating the difficulty of objectively distinguishing between defensive and provocative arms transfers, one could think of regional agreements on what constitutes clearly excessive or destabilizing conventional military capabilities.

Further development and expansion of the Register

1994, first evaluation

In thinking about the future of the Register of Conventional Arms, the year 1994 immediately comes to mind, since that year will be the first opportunity for a thorough evaluation of the operation of the Register. Let me explain why.

First, by 1994 the Register will have accumulated two years of data on conventional arms transfers, namely concerning 1992 (to be reported by 30 April of this year) and 1993 (to be reported by 30 April of next year). Thus, we will know more about the Register in the *practical* sense:

- How many Member States have returned the standardized reporting form?
- What other information was provided by Member States?
- Is the standardized reporting form satisfactory?
- How are data being handled and compiled by the United Nations?
- To what extent is the Register being consulted by Member States?

and so on and so forth.

Secondly, 1994 will be the year in which the Register will have to be evaluated in a more *conceptual* sense:

- To what extent has the Register contributed, as a first step, to an enhanced level of transparency in armaments, and thereby to confidence-building, early warning and international security?
- What can be done to further develop and expand the Register?

Preparation of future work

In 1994, at its forty-ninth session, the United Nations General Assembly will have to take a decision concerning the continuing operation of the Register of Conventional Arms and its further development. To that end the Secretary-General will submit a new report, the mainstay of which will no doubt be constituted by the results of the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts (see page 42). The General Assembly will also have at its disposal the report of the Conference on Disarmament (see pages 41 and 46 to 47).

All this sounds reasonably upbeat. Still, we must bear in mind that the development of the Register into a universal, comprehensive confidence-building instrument is a gradual process. The Register pertains to armament. Arms are indispensable instruments to ensure a nation's security. National security is at the heart of the policies of any responsible Government. It is vital that Member States feel convinced that whatever information they disclose is consonant with national security considerations; indeed, they should feel that their security is enhanced by participation in the Register. This is true both for developed and developing countries. Notably for the latter a judicious level of defence spending is often perceived, both by their own citizenry and by foreign investors, as a signal that the Government is taking its security responsibilities seriously. This is a *conditio sine qua non* for internal and external stability. In this context I refer to the role of the military as a nation-building instrument in many developing countries. These factors are partly psychological, non-quantifiable. Yet, the advantages of putting a halt to unaffordable arms races and of concentrating scarce resources on socio-economic development are too obvious for the Register not to be given its proper chance for further development.

Suffice it to say that the process will take time. Realism is called for, especially in a world rife with regional and ethnic conflicts. And even without such bloody confrontations, it took the States participating in the CSCE nearly 20 years to come to a stage where the seemingly endless talks finally yielded concrete, binding measures. This is an example from my own region. I should add, in general, that the underlying political factors should allow for such developments. Political willingness, based on rational calculation of national interests, must bring States to the belief that negotiations can effectively help frame solutions to security concerns which beset their relationships with others.

Overcoming definitional problems may be another time-consuming exercise. To be reported under the Register are items of equipment, belonging to the well-known seven categories of the Register (see page 39), which are "imported into or exported from their (that is the Member States,) territory". As the Panel concluded, this terminology needs some clarification, although the difficulties may be overcome through the practice of States in submitting their reports. In addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, international arms transfer involves the transfer of title to and control over the equipment. An international arms transfer may also occur without the movement of equipment across State borders if a State, or its agent, is granted title and control over the equipment in the territory of the supplier State.

This is not the place to go into further detail about all sorts of specific cases involving forces abroad, equipment prepositioned on the territory of another State, e.g. in the framework of United Nations peace-keeping operations. Apart from these legal considerations, there are administrative aspects: from State to State different national criteria are used to define when a transfer becomes effective. So, even if one and the same transfer is reported by the supplier and the recipient, discrepancies may occur. A special case is constituted by the virtual non-existence of national export control systems in some of the successor States of the former Soviet Union.

The collation and compilation of data and information received from Member States is a daunting task for the Office for Disarmament Affairs within the UN Secretariat. This confidence-building measure will work only if the Secretariat is able to process the information and make it available to Member States promptly when requested. It is vital to the success of the Register that sufficient resources are allocated to this task. It is to be noted here that the Register also contains provisions for access of the public.

Issues to be taken up by the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts

Evidently, the agenda for the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts will contain such items as:

- definitions
- modification of the existing parameters of the seven categories
- inclusion of new categories
- inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production.

As to the first item I mentioned, a prerequisite to meaningful work on the Register in its present form as well as on its further development is that the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts tackles the definitional problems I have just referred to. The development of a common terminology pertaining to the description of international transfers remains an important aim. Definitional problems will, however, occur also in relation to the other three would-be agenda items.

As to the second item I mentioned, while considering the possibility of modifying the existing parameters of the seven categories, one could think of, for instance, lowering the tonnage of warships or the calibre of large-calibre artillery systems or the range of missiles. The exclusion of ground-to-air missiles from category VII might be undone.

The designation of equipment and similar characteristics might be added to the reporting requirements. New parameters might be introduced such as the weight of equipment. Subcategorization might be another new parameter, for example, by broadening the existing title of category IV "combat aircraft" and bringing in suppression of air defence, reconnaissance or electronic warfare aircraft as subcategories in their own right. Another example is the possible disaggregation of missiles and missile launchers.

As to the third item I mentioned, one could envisage including new categories, for instance fuel-air explosives and other special ammunition, cluster bombs or remotely delivered mines. It should be kept in mind, however, that the inclusion of ammunition in the Register does raise particular problems in relation to military security. In this respect significant technical developments would obviously be taken into account. I mention media reports about new non-lethality weapons which might have a destabilizing potential. An electromagnetic "pulse" generator that disables equipment without hurting people is an example. I should add that the feasibility of such systems becoming operational in the near future is by no means certain. All the same, the addition of new categories should not compromise prospects of ensuring the widest possible participation in the Register. A key principle for adding categories should be that of military relevance in terms of the significance of their impact on regional and global stability. The Panel's report contains a long list of specific issues which may be raised in the 1994 Group, and thereafter, in relation to the scope of certain categories of equipment. In all this, it seems useful to keep in mind that arms sales nowadays concern notably components and subsystems. This might be a complicating factor, since naturally there are limits to scaling down items to be reported. Otherwise one might risk not seeing the forest for the trees.

As to the fourth item I mentioned, inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production would certainly go a long way to alleviate concerns of States about the overall military capability and military production of their neighbours or leading regional States. This matter is also relevant with a view to obviating possible inequalities between importing States and those whose arms requirements are met entirely from indigenous production.

Obviously, inclusion in the Register of data on military holdings and procurement through national production constitutes a substantive change in the scope of the Register. Here again, quite a bit of definitional work will have to be done. Many questions have to be answered. I mention a few.

There are the questions relating to military holdings. What constitutes armed forces for the purpose of reporting military holdings? Are those of paramilitary and coastguard forces to be included? Should the same seven categories used for arms transfers be applied while reporting military holdings? Should equipment in storage or mothballed, awaiting decommissioning or in transit be considered as military holdings and be included?

Questions regarding data on procurement through national production pertain to the following issues. Should data be reported in values and/or in the number of items procured? Are monetary values qualitatively relevant indicators, given fluctuations in exchange rates and in purchasing power? In this context, can the United Nations standardized system of reporting on military expenditures be revitalized? Should procurement be regarded as procurement

from any national production facility, whatever the arrangement may be, for example, international collaborative production, licence and so forth?

Another aspect to be taken into account is that, in a State like mine, the Government can obtain and possibly divulge data and information on production by private firms only if proprietary rights and the rules on commercial confidentiality are not violated. The State authorities must have at their disposal the required legal means for obtaining and possibly divulging such data and information.

Then there is the question of the comparability of statistics, presentation and collation of figures.

Setting up the managerial and administrative structures to handle this kind of material within the database of the Office for Disarmament Affairs requires previous international agreement.

Other interrelated aspects of transparency in armaments

The transparency process and weapons of mass destruction

Provision of data and information on possession of weapons of mass destruction is clearly tantamount to widening the scope of the transparency exercise beyond registering conventional arms transfers. I underline the term transfers, for after the entry into force of the chemical weapons Convention (to be expected in two years' time) there will exist a coherent interlocking network of international agreements prohibiting any transfer of any weapon of mass destruction.

The basic idea here is that the Register would in due course contain data and information on military outlays as well as aggregate military force structures and figures. This is certainly a long haul. It should not be forgotten, however, that a good deal of information on nuclear holdings is already in the public domain. For instance, the full texts of treaties like START and START-II are issued as documents of the Conference on Disarmament, and are thus widely disseminated. These texts provide information on the size of the nuclear arsenals of the major Powers.

Important support for making progress in creating a climate propitious to sharing data and information about both conventional and nuclear forces between non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon States is to be derived from the almost universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the appertaining IAEA safeguards system. Regional arrangements, like the Euratom Treaty, and nuclear-free zones, like the ones established by the recently reinforced Treaty of Tlatelolco and the Rarotonga Treaty are further invaluable mechanisms conducive to evolving a general environment of cooperative security and trust.

The same holds true, *mutatis mutandis*, for the brand new Convention on chemical weapons, whose effectively verifiable provisions should lead to total transparency. In a similar vein, the attempts to give a binding verification regime to the biological weapons Convention bode well for the future. These are positive factors, fully consonant with the requirement of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L that transparency in this field must be developed in accordance with existing legal instruments.

The transparency process and high technology with military applications

Resolution 46/36 L mentions the transfer of high technology with military applications as one of the constitutive elements in the transparency process. Now of course, technology is not

weaponry, at best it is potential weapons. And we discuss here the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. Anyway, this is not the place to address the totality of the complex process whereby new technology, expertise and know-how are transferred from one State to another. Last year's General Assembly produced a welcome expression of the ongoing dialogue between suppliers and recipients of dual-use technology, in the form of resolution 47/44, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields". The main proponents of that resolution were Brazil and Germany.

I recall in this context that during its 1993 session, the Disarmament Commission is going to continue its consideration of the proposal by Argentina and Brazil for seeking universally acceptable international norms or guidelines that would regulate international transfers of sensitive technologies (see A/CN.10/145). It is an understatement to observe that the approaches advocated on behalf of the European Community, first, by the Netherlands (see A/CN.10/155) and, secondly, by Portugal (see A/CN.10/165), entertain a dialectical relationship to the proposal by Argentina and Brazil.

Obviously, universal adherence to and compliance with effectively verifiable non-proliferation agreements would greatly facilitate the dialogue I have just referred to. Encouraging signs come from some regions of the world where, until recently, existing relevant norms were not fully observed. For instance, 29 important suppliers from both industrialized and industrializing countries are complying, *de jure* or *de facto*, with the Missile Technology Control Regime. The time seems to have come when parallel approaches could be explored alongside those based primarily or solely on restrictions and on technology denial.

Here the concept of transparency comes into play as one of the devices which can facilitate the possible transit from denial to conditioned access. I stress, however, that it is my deep conviction that self-denial and restraint will in the long run be the only way to arrive at the stage of implementation of the principle of freedom of access to technology for all States with a view to increasing their development, with due respect for the requirements of non-proliferation and commercial proprietary rights.

The Conference on Disarmament is presently working on ways and means of using existing and future arrangements that cover the complex issues pertaining to the place of weapons of mass destruction and high technology with military applications within the transparency process, in order to establish a sound basis for this supplementary part of our common enterprise under the rubric "transparency in armaments".

Conclusion

In summary, there is no doubt that transparency is a process which has a clearly defined further growth pattern. A family of efforts, consisting of formal and informal approaches, both within and outside the United Nations system, at international, regional and subregional levels, is well under way to execute a new, challenging security agenda.

As a constituent part of this process, the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, through its intrinsic value and thanks to parallel endeavours, may effectively help to reduce the occurrence of dangerous misperceptions as well as to promote transparency, trust and partnership between nations. It is up to the Member States to avail themselves, in their own best interest, of this challenging instrument.

In practical terms, I venture the thought that in due course the Register might be enh ınced by a consultative mechanism, of whatever nature. Common analysis and review of

data and information provided would help participants in the Register to develop clearer understandings of each other's view of how security is affected by arms acquisition. It might also allow for an exchange of views on cases where excessive build-ups might be developing. In the absence of such a consultative mechanism, it is to be hoped that in the near future the practice of bilateral consultation on the basis of data and information provided to the Register may constitute a preliminary useful means of communication; consultation, when needed, on a regional basis might also be consistent (see page 39) and is, in fact, getting under way.

The ship designed and constructed under the aegis of the General Assembly of the United Nations has successfully been launched. What is required now is to steer a safe course. I say, safe, because we will have to avoid many shoals and reefs. We have aboard a crew that is globally representative. Greater security is our port of call. The transparency exercise and the Register of Conventional Arms, between them, offer a viable means to reach that destination. From this it follows that the Register is not an end in itself. It also follows from this that we can only arrive at our destination if all crew members, that is to say Member States, live up to their commitments.

The year 1994 will be the first big test for the Register: how is it operating? Looking beyond 1994 is mere speculation. One thing is certain, the Register of Conventional Arms should not be seen as an isolated instrument that can enhance transparency in armaments all by itself. Rather, it is part of a broader policy of boosting international confidence-building: a family of efforts. By establishing the Register, the international community has created a unique confidence-building and early-warning tool that has great potential if States are prepared to use it.

Part V

United Nations Register of Conventional Arms
Exports

Reporting country:
Original language:
Background information provided: yes/no

Calendar year:
Date of submission:

	B	C	D*	E*	REMARKS+	
Category (I–VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks						
II. Armoured combat vehicles						
III. Large calibre artillery systems						
IV. Combat aircraft						
V. Attack helicopters						
VI. Warships						
VII. Missiles and missile launchers						

* See document A/47/342, para. 18.
\+ See document A/47/342, para. 19.

Imports

Reporting country:
Original language:
Background information provided: yes/no

Calendar year:
Date of submission:

	B	C	D*	E*	REMARKS+	
Category (I–VII)	Exporter State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks						
II. Armoured combat vehicles						
III. Large calibre artillery systems						
IV. Combat aircraft						
V. Attack helicopters						
VI. Warships						
VII. Missiles and missile launchers						

* See document A/47/342, para. 18.
+ See document A/47/342, para. 19.

Litho in United Nations, New York
93009—January 1994—3,250